

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1 and 8-53 stand rejected; and claims 2-7 stand objected to. By this amendment, claims 31 and 48 have been amended, and claim 43 has been canceled. This application now includes claims 1-42 and 44-53.

Applicant hereby cancels claim 43, without prejudice or disclaimer, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present patent application.

The Examiner has objected to claims 2-7 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that claims 2-7 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability regarding claims 2-7.

However, in view of Applicant's response to the rejection of claim 1, set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16-24, 26, 28, 30, 48, and 50-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kato, U.S. Patent No. 6,141,111 (hereinafter, Kato). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16-24, 26, 28, 30, 48, and 50-53 in view of the following.

Kato is directed to printing, including providing various designations relative to an extra-copy printing using, for instance, an extra-copy designation sheet (col. 1, lines 8-10). An extra-copy designation sheet 100, includes a user ID input portion 101, a bin output selection portion 104, an E-mail deliver selection portion 105, an image index portion 102 and

an extra-copy check portion 103 (col. 5, lines 25-29). In order to produce the extra-copy designation sheet 100, image data taken by a digital still camera is stored in image data memory 65 of image printer 26, and when the operator designates printing of the designation sheet 100, CPU 1 of image printer 26 compresses the image data, which is used for image index portion 102 (col. 5, lines 48-61), and the extra-copy designation sheet 100 is printed based on the number of copies of the image (col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, lines 5).

Kato discloses a process wherein an image is taken by digital still camera 11 at step S1, which is transferred to the image printer at step S2 (col. 6, lines 6-16, Fig. 5). The image printer then produces the extra-copy designation sheet 100 at step S3, and the operator then enters information onto the extra-copy designation sheet 100 at step S4, and inputs extra-copy designation sheet 100 into image printer 26 at step S5 (col. 6, lines 17-25, Fig. 5).

At step S6, image printer 26 recognizes the data entered by the operator, and stores the recognition results in extra-copy designation sheet recognition result data portion 58 at step S7 (col. 6, lines 26-33, Fig. 5). The images are then emailed or sorted by user ID and printed at steps S8-S10 (col. 6, lines 34-52, Fig. 5).

Applicant believes that claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16-24, 26, 28, 30, 48, and 50-53 patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for selecting images from a plurality of images obtained from a digital device for printing with an imaging apparatus, said imaging apparatus having a scanner and accessing a memory storing said plurality of images.

Claim 1 recites, in part, generating a selection sheet from said thumbnail printout by placing a first designation mark on said thumbnail printout for each thumbnail of said

plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of said plurality of images on which a first action is to be taken; detecting said first designation mark by scanning said selection sheet with said scanner; printing a confirmation for confirming to a user that said each image on which said first action to be taken is designated; and performing said first action based on said detecting said first designation mark.

Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest printing a confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which the first action to be taken is designated; and performing the first action based on detecting the first designation mark, as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Kato discloses that image printer produces the extra-copy designation sheet 100 at step S3, and the operator then enters information onto the extra-copy designation sheet 100 at step S4, and inputs extra-copy designation sheet 100 into image printer 26 at step S5 (col. 6, lines 17-25, Fig. 5).

Subsequently, image printer 26 recognizes the data entered by the operator at step S6, and stores the recognition results in extra-copy designation sheet recognition result data portion 58 at step S7 (col. 6, lines 26-33, Fig. 5). The images are then emailed or sorted by user ID and printed at steps S8-S10 (col. 6, lines 34-52, Fig. 5).

Thus, Kato discloses that once the user enters the information onto the extra-copy designation sheet 100 at step S4 and inputs the extra-copy designation sheet 100 into image printer 26 at step S5, image printer recognizes the data entered by the operator at step S7, and emails and/or prints the images at steps S8-S10, which generally corresponds to performing the first action based on detecting the first designation mark, but without confirming the

selection indicated by the information entered by the user, much less printing a confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which the first action to be taken is designated.

However, the Examiner asserts that printing the designated image is a means of confirming. Applicant respectfully submits that printing the designated image is the performing of the action that is sought to be confirmed in claim 1, rather than confirming the action to be performed. The confirmation of an action and the action itself are two separate things. For example, confirming a doctor's appointment is a separate act from the appointment itself, and is intended to confirm, i.e., make sure, that the appointment will be met, prior to the time of the appointment.

In addition, claim 1 recites printing a confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which the first action to be taken is designated, which clearly indicates that the confirmation of claim 1 pertains to confirming the future act of performing the first action, that is, confirming that the first action is designated before the first action is performed.

Still further, claim 1 recites both printing the confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which the first action to be taken is designated and performing the first action based on detecting the first designation mark. The Kato single act of printing the designated image does not disclose, teach, or suggest the two separate acts of printing the confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which the first action to be taken is designated and performing the first action based on detecting the first designation mark, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Kato discloses outputting the images after the user has input extra-copy designation sheet 100 into image printer 26, without the image printer performing any action

akin to printing a confirmation for confirming to a user that each image on which first action to be taken is designated, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 13, and 16 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 1. In addition, claims 8, 9, 11, 13, and 16 further and patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato.

For example, claim 9 is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein the step of performing said first action includes inhibiting printing.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the step of performing the first action includes inhibiting printing, as recited in claim 9.

Although the Examiner asserts that the Kato images that are not designated by the first mark for printing are not printed out, which assertedly discloses inhibiting printing, Applicant respectfully submits that, as recited in claim 1, performing the first action is based on detecting the first designation mark. Thus, with Applicant's invention, the rather than not printing an image that is not designated, the printing of designated images is inhibited, which is the opposite of what the Examiner asserts.

That is, rather than not printing based on not detecting a designation mark, Applicant's claimed invention performs the action of inhibiting printing, as recited in claim 9, based on detecting the first designation mark.

For example, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to Applicant's specification at page 14, lines 8-10, which is reproduced below for the sake of convenience.

In a case where the user wishes to print all of plurality of images 56 except for a certain image or certain images, step S212 includes printing all images except for those images designation for the action of inhibiting printing. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, claim 9 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 11 is directed to the method of claim 1. Claim 11 recites, in part, wherein the step of printing said confirmation includes printing a first confirmation mark and a second confirmation mark different from said first confirmation mark.

Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest printing a confirmation for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1. In addition, Kato simply does not print any confirmation marks, much less a first confirmation mark and a second confirmation mark different from the first confirmation mark, as recited in claim 11.

Accordingly, claim 11 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 16 is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein said scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of said imaging apparatus.

Although Kato discloses a scanner 3 (col. 3, line 53), Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest what type of scanner that scanner 3 is, much less that scanner 3 is an alignment sensor for aligning a printhead of an imaging apparatus.

In addition, although Kato discloses the use of an extra-copy designation sheet recognition portion 57, Kato simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest any details of extra-

copy designation sheet recognition portion 57 such as might disclose, teach, or suggest an alignment sensor for aligning a printhead of an imaging apparatus.

Although the Examiner asserts that “the scanner must have some way of aligning in order for the image data to be read and acted upon,” Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s assertion is not based on any statement or admission in the Kato disclosure. The Kato reference simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest detecting a first designation mark by scanning the selection sheet with a scanner, as recited in claim 1, wherein the scanner is an alignment sensor for aligning a printhead of an imaging apparatus, as recited in claim 16.

Accordingly, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of the imaging apparatus.

Accordingly, claim 16 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 17 is directed to a method for selecting images from a plurality of images obtained from a digital device for printing with an imaging apparatus, said imaging apparatus having a scanner and accessing a memory storing said plurality of images.

Claim 17 recites, in part, generating a selection sheet from said thumbnail printout by placing a first designation mark directly on each thumbnail of said plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of said plurality of images on which a first action is to be taken.

In contrast to claim 17, Kato discloses an extra-copy designation sheet 100, includes a user ID input portion 101, a bin output selection portion 104, an E-mail deliver selection portion 105, an image index portion 102 and an extra-copy check portion 103 (col. 5, lines 25-29). As indicated in Kato Fig. 4A, any information entered by the operator onto extra-copy designation sheet 100 is entered onto one or more of user ID input portion 101, bin output

selection portion 104, E-mail deliver selection portion 105, and/or extra-copy check portion 103. However, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest entering any information directly on the images of image index portion 102, e.g., IMAGE A, IMAGE B, etc., as depicted in Kato Figs. 4, 6, or 8, such as might otherwise pertain to placing a designation mark directly on each thumbnail, as recited in claim 17.

Thus, in contrast to generating a selection sheet from the thumbnail printout by placing a first designation mark directly on each thumbnail of a plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of the plurality of images on which a first action is to be taken, Kato discloses the operator entering information in boxes of the extra-copy designation sheet 100, and not directly on any thumbnail.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 17.

Claims 18-24, 26, 28, and 30 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 17. In addition, claims 18-24, 26, 28, and 30 further and patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato.

For example, claim 19 is directed to the method of claim 17, wherein the step of performing said first action is based on a known location of said each thumbnail corresponding to said each image on which said first action is to be taken.

Kato simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest any details as to how the Kato apparatus performs recognition of marks entered by the operator, much less that such recognition is based on a known location of said each thumbnail corresponding to said each image on which said first action is to be taken, as recited in claim 19. Rather, Kato simply

states that image printer 26 recognizes and stores the data (col. 6, lines 26-33), without explaining how image printer 26 does so recognize the data.

Accordingly, claim 19 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 20 is directed to the method of claim 17, said thumbnail printout further including a print option symbol. Claim 20 recites, in part, placing an option designation mark directly on said print option symbol on said selection sheet to designate a print option.

Although Kato discloses in Fig. 8 that “IMAGE QUALITY” and “IMAGE SIZE” are respectively printed beside an image quality designation portion 304 and an image size designation portion that are check boxes, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest placing an option designation mark on the printed words “IMAGE QUALITY” or “IMAGE SIZE.” In contrast, Kato discloses placing information in a box that is not a print option symbol to select the image quality and size.

In addition, the printed words, words “IMAGE QUALITY” or “IMAGE SIZE,” are not “symbols” within the context of Applicant’s claimed invention, but rather, are printed words.

Accordingly, claim 20 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 21 is directed to the method of claim 20, wherein said print option symbol is one of a plurality of print option symbols, said option designation mark is one of a plurality of option designation marks, and said print option is one of a plurality of print options.

As set forth above with respect to claim 20, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest a print option symbol within the context of Applicant's claimed invention, much less a plurality of print option symbols.

Accordingly, claim 21 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 24 is directed to the method of claim 17, wherein the step of performing said first action includes inhibiting printing.

Claim 24 is believed allowable in its own right for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 9.

Claim 26 is directed to the method of claim 17. Claim 26 recites, in part, wherein the step of generating said selection sheet further includes placing a second designation mark directly on each thumbnail of said plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of said plurality of images on which a second action is to be taken, said second designation mark being different from said first designation mark, and said second action being different from said first action.

Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest placing a designation mark directly on a thumbnail, as recited in claim 26, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 17.

Accordingly, claim 26 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 30 is directed to the method of claim 17, wherein said scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of said imaging apparatus.

Claim 30 is believed allowable in its own right for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16.

Claim 48 is directed to a method for selecting images from a plurality of images obtained from a digital device for printing with an imaging apparatus, said imaging apparatus having a scanner and accessing a memory storing said plurality of images.

As amended, claim 48 recites, in part, placing a first designation mark directly on each thumbnail of said plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of said plurality of images on which a first action is to be taken; and placing a second designation mark directly on each thumbnail of said plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of said plurality of images on which a second action is to be taken, said second designation mark being different from said first designation mark, and said second action being different from said first action.

In contrast to claim 48, Kato discloses an extra-copy designation sheet 100, includes a user ID input portion 101, a bin output selection portion 104, an E-mail deliver selection portion 105, an image index portion 102 and an extra-copy check portion 103 (col. 5, lines 25-29). As indicated in Kato Fig. 4A, any information entered by the operator onto extra-copy designation sheet 100 is entered onto one or more of user ID input portion 101, bin output selection portion 104, E-mail deliver selection portion 105, and/or extra-copy check portion 103. However, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest entering any information directly on the images of image index portion 102, e.g., IMAGE A, IMAGE B, etc., as depicted in Kato Figs. 4, 6, or 8, such as might otherwise pertain to placing a designation mark directly on each thumbnail, as recited in claim 48.

Thus, in contrast to placing a first designation mark directly on each thumbnail of the plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of the plurality of images on which a first action is to be taken; and placing a second designation mark directly on each thumbnail of the plurality of thumbnails corresponding to each image of the plurality of images on which a second action is to be taken, the second designation mark being different from the first designation mark, and the second action being different from the first action, Kato discloses the operator entering information on portions of the extra-copy designation sheet 100, and not directly on any thumbnail.

Accordingly, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 48.

Claims 50-53 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 48. In addition, claims 49-53 further and patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato.

For example, claim 53 is directed to the method of claim 48, wherein said scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of said imaging apparatus.

Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of the imaging apparatus for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 53 is believed allowable in its own right.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16-24, 26, 28, 30, 48, and 50-53 are in condition for allowance in their present

form, and thus respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16-24, 26, 28, 30, 48, and 50-53 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kato and Lumley, U.S. Patent No. 7,009,726 B2. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49 in view of the following.

Claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49 are believed allowable due to their dependence on their otherwise allowable respective base claims 1, 17, and 48, since, as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 17, and 48, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 17, and 48, and Lumley does not make up for the deficiency of Kato as applied to claims 1, 17, and 48, nor does the Examiner assert as much. Rather, the Examiner relies on Lumley for the subject matter recited in claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and thus respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 31-41, 43, 44, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kato and Yoshihara, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,031,632 (hereinafter, Yoshihara). By the present Amendment, Applicant has incorporated the subject matter of claim 43 into claim 31, and has canceled claim 43. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 31-41, 44, and 46 in view of the following.

Yoshihara is directed to an image retrieval apparatus capable of printing a mark sheet for retrieval (col. 1, lines 11-12). Yoshihara discloses a reader unit 1 for converting an original into image data, coupled to a printer unit 2 for outputting the image data onto a recording sheet (col. 2, lines 46-52, Fig. 1). Reader unit 1 includes an original-feeding device 101 that conveys originals onto an original-mount glass 102, which is scanned by a CCD 109 based scanner unit 104 (col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 6, Figs. 2 and 3).

Yoshihara discloses a mark sheet having marks 1105 and 1106 that identify the sheet as a mark sheet, and are also used for correcting misregistration of the mark sheet; a mark 1107 that is used for discriminating between the up and down positions of the mark sheet, and for correcting misregistration of the mark sheet; and a mark 1108 is used for correcting misregistration of the mark sheet (col. 10, lines 28-33, Fig. 7). The mark sheet is read by reader unit 1 (col. 11, line 28). If the mark 1107 for discriminating between the up and down positions of the mark sheet is present immediately below the mark 1105, it is determined that the up and down positions of the mark sheet are correct, whereas if the mark 1107 is absent, i.e., if the mark sheet is identified by the mark 1106, it is determined that the up and down positions of the mark sheet are reversed (col. 12, lines 32-38).

Applicant believes that claims 31-41, 44, and 46 patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 31 is directed to a method for selecting images from a plurality of images obtained from a digital device for printing with an imaging apparatus, said imaging apparatus having a scanner and accessing a memory storing said plurality of images.

As amended, claim 31 recites, in part, detecting said at least one orientation symbol by scanning said selection sheet with said scanner, wherein said scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of said imaging apparatus.

Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of the imaging apparatus for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16.

In contrast to detecting the at least one orientation symbol by scanning the selection sheet with the scanner, wherein the scanner is an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of the imaging apparatus, as recited in claim 31, Yoshihara discloses a reader unit 1 for converting an original into image data, coupled to a printer unit 2 for outputting the image data onto a recording sheet (col. 2, lines 46-52, Fig. 1). Reader unit 1 includes an original-feeding device 101 that conveys originals onto an original-mount glass 102, which is scanned by a CCD 109 based scanner unit 104 (col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 6, Figs. 2 and 3). The mark sheet is read by reader unit 1 (col. 11, line 28).

Thus, Yoshihara discloses that the mark sheet is read by a conventional flat bed CCD-based scanner 104 (see Fig. 2), which does not disclose, teach, or suggest an alignment sensor used for aligning a printhead of the imaging apparatus.

Accordingly, Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 31, and hence, the combination of Kato and Yoshihara would not yield Applicant's invention of amended claim 31.

Claim 31 is thus believed allowable in its present amended form.

Claims 32-41, 44, and 46 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 31. In addition, claims 32-41, 44, and 46 further and patentably define Applicant's invention over Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination.

For example, claim 34 is directed to the method of claim 33, wherein said at least one orientation symbol is configured to indicate at least four possible orientations of said thumbnail printout.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest orientation symbols.

In contrast to claim 34, wherein the at least one orientation symbol is configured to indicate at least four possible orientations of the thumbnail printout, as recited in claim 34, Yoshihara discloses that a mark 1107 that is used for discriminating between the up and down positions of the mark sheet (col. 10, lines 30-31).

Thus, the Yoshihara mark 1107 is configured to indicate only two possible orientations of mark sheet 1107.

Accordingly, Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 34, and hence, the combination of Kato and Yoshihara would not yield Applicant's invention of claim 34. Claim 34 is thus believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 37 is directed to the method of claim 36, wherein said orientation is determined based on detecting a number of elongate bars.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest orientation symbols.

In contrast to wherein the orientation is determined based on detecting a number of elongate bars, Yoshihara discloses that if the mark 1107 for discriminating between the up and down positions of the mark sheet is present immediately below the mark 1105, it is determined that the up and down positions of the mark sheet are correct, whereas if the mark 1107 is absent, i.e., if the mark sheet is identified by the mark 1106, it is determined that the up and down positions of the mark sheet are reversed (col. 12, lines 32-38).

Thus, Yoshihara discloses that orientation is determined based on whether the mark 1107 is below mark 1105, which pertains to the position of mark 1107 relative to mark 1107, which hence does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the orientation is determined based on detecting a number of elongate bars.

Accordingly, Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 37, and hence, the combination of Kato and Yoshihara would not yield Applicant's invention of claim 37. Claim 37 is thus believed allowable in its own right.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 31-41, 44, and 46 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and thus respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 31-41, 44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 42, 45, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kato and Yoshihara, as applied to claim 31, and in further view of

Lumley. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 42, 45, and 47 in view of the following.

Claims 42, 45, and 47 are believed allowable due to their dependence on their otherwise allowable base claim 31, since, as set forth above with respect to 31, Kato and Yoshihara, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 31, and Lumley does not make up for the deficiency of Kato and Yoshihara as applied to claim 31, nor does the Examiner assert as much. Rather, the Examiner relies on Lumley for the subject matter recited in claims 42, 45, and 47.


Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 42, 45, and 47 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and thus respectfully request that the rejection of claims 42, 45, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that no combination of the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests the subject matter of the appended claims. The appended claims are therefore in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicant has overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicant hereby conditionally petitions therefor and authorizes that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (317) 894-0801.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul C. Gosnell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Paul" being the most prominent.

Paul C. Gosnell
Registration No. 46,735

Attorney for Applicant

RKA14/ts

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
12029 E. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46229
Telephone: 317-894-0801
Facsimile: 317-894-0803

Electronically Filed: September 22, 2006